



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,953	08/02/2001	Molian Deng	38-21(52114)B	9080
27161	7590	12/11/2007		
MONSANTO COMPANY 800 N. LINDBERGH BLVD. ATTENTION: GAIL P. WUELLNER, IP PARALEGAL, (E2NA) ST. LOUIS, MO 63167			EXAMINER MARTINELL, JAMES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MAILED  
DEC 11 2007  
GROUP 1600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/920,953  
Filing Date: August 02, 2001  
Appellant(s): DENG ET AL.

Gautam Prakash, Ph.D.  
For Appellant

**SECOND EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed March 12, 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed October 10, 2006. This Second Examiner's Answer is submitted solely to correct the defects noted in the Appeal Center Return of July 26, 2007. The errors are regretted. No grounds of rejection or new arguments are contained in this Second Examiner's Answer.

Art Unit: 1634

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal:

- (a) Serial No. 09/619,643; Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences No. 2002-2046; Federal Circuit Case No. 04-1465; *Ex parte* Fisher, 72 USPQ2d 1020 (Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences 2004); *In re* Fisher, 421 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2005),
- (b) Serial No. 09/684,016,
- (c) Serial No. 10/361,942, and
- (d) Serial No. 09/199129.
- (e) Serial No. 09/615,606; Appeal 2006-3376, decided February 28, 2007.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

- (a) Appellants refer to page 6, lines 34-35 as disclosing the subject matter of independent claim 11. It is noted that a more relevant discussion of the subject matter of claim 11 occurs in the specification at page 3, lines 3-5.
- (b) Appellants refer to page 7, lines 7-3 as disclosing the subject matter of independent claim 12. It is noted that a more relevant discussion of the subject matter of claim 12 occurs in the specification at page 7, lines 7-31.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

No evidence is relied upon by the examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal.

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-4 and 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. The instant application does not disclose a specific, substantial, and credible utility for SEQ ID NO: 2 or for any polypeptide that is encoded by SEQ ID NO: 2. Table 1 shows that SEQ ID NO: 2 encodes a polypeptide that is 81% identical to the 60S ribosomal protein L10 of *Solanum melongena*.

The instant application does not disclose a patentable utility for either SEQ ID NO: 2 or any polypeptide

Art Unit: 1634

encoded by SEQ ID NO: 2. In addition, a patentable utility is not readily apparent to one of skill in the art based upon the disclosure in the instant application and what was known in the art as of the effective filing date of the instant claims. For example, see the Office action mailed March 10, 2004, page 4, first full paragraph.

Claims 1-4 and 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Since the claimed invention lacks utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the instant application does not teach how to use the invention.

## **(10) Response to Argument**

### **A. Summary of Examiner's Position**

Claims 1-4 and 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. The instant application does not disclose a specific, substantial, and credible utility for SEQ ID NO: 2 or for any polypeptide that is encoded by SEQ ID NO: 2. Table 1 shows that SEQ ID NO: 2 encodes a polypeptide that is 81% identical to the 60S ribosomal protein L10 of *Solanum melongena*. The instant application does not disclose a patentable utility for either SEQ ID NO: 2 or any polypeptide encoded by SEQ ID NO: 2. In addition, a patentable utility is not readily apparent to one of skill in the art based upon the disclosure in the instant application and what was known in the art as of the effective filing date of the instant claims. For example, see the Office action mailed March 10, 2004, page 4, first full paragraph.

Art Unit: 1634

Claims 1-4 and 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Since the claimed invention lacks utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the instant application does not teach how to use the invention.

**B. The Claimed Nucleic Acids Do Not Have Utility Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Appellants' arguments (brief filed March 12, 2007, pages 4-9, section B) are not convincing. Appellants assert (Brief, paragraph bridging pages 4-5) that the specification at page 9, lines 15-17 and page 68 (Table 1) discloses that SEQ ID NO: 2 encodes 60S ribosomal protein L10 or a fragment thereof. However, no mention of SEQ ID NO: 2 or what it may or may not encode is seen at page 9, lines 15-17 of the specification in the instant application. Page 9, lines 15-17 states, "The BLAST program uses as defaults a wordlength (W) of 11, the BLOSUM62 scoring matrix (see Henikoff, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 89: 10915-10919(1992)) alignments (B) of 50, expectation (E) of 10, M=5, N=4, and a comparison of both strands. The term BLAST refers to the BLAST algorithm which performs a statistical". It is accurate that Table 1 shows that SEQ ID NO: 2 encodes a polypeptide that is 81% identical to the 60S ribosomal protein L10 of *Solanum melongena*.

Appellants go on to assert that one of skill in the art "would readily recognize that the claimed nucleic acid molecules and cells have utility, for example, to encode a 60S Ribosomal Protein L10 or to modify the expression of 60S Ribosomal Protein L10 in a transformed cell." That one of skill in the art would recognize that a transformed cell could be produced using SEQ ID NO: 2 is not contested here. What is at issue is whether such a "utility" is a patentable utility that meets the criteria of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Appellants repeatedly assert that SEQ ID NO: 2 encodes a 60S Ribosomal Protein L10 or a fragment thereof (Brief filed March 12, 2007, page 4, lines 20-23; page 5, lines 1-3; page 6, lines 16-17; page 6, lines 20-23; page 7, lines 1-2; page 7, lines 7-8; and page 9, lines 1-5) and that that fact alone is sufficient to establish a specific, substantial, and credible utility for the claimed polynucleotides and

Art Unit: 1634

transformed host cells. It remains that Appellants have identified just what real world application or utility or just what public benefit follows from knowing that SEQ ID NO: 2 encodes a 60S Ribosomal Protein L10.

It is reiterated here that applicants confuse the identification of a function of a protein with a patentable utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (Final rejection mailed October 10, 2006, page 4). Appellants assert that this statement misses the point (Brief filed March 12, 2007, page 5, line 13). This assertion is most unconvincing because it is exactly the point of this rejection that merely knowing the identity of a polypeptide that has no substantial utility as the molecule encoded by the claimed polynucleotides and included in the claimed transformed host cells is insufficient to meet the utility standard under 35 U.S.C. § 101. It is the USPTO that determines and applies the grounds for rejection, not Appellants. Appellants have not shown where the application as filed discloses a substantial utility for SEQ ID NO: 2 or any polypeptide encoded by SEQ ID NO: 2. Appellants have not disclosed a substantial utility for SEQ ID NO: 2 or any polypeptide encoded by SEQ ID NO: 2 in any of their arguments. Appellants have not shown how or why one of skill in the art would arrive at a substantial utility for SEQ ID NO: 2 or any polypeptide encoded by SEQ ID NO: 2 in any of their arguments. Appellants have not cited any authority for the notion that mere identification of the polypeptide or the function of the polypeptide encoded by a polynucleotide is sufficient to meet the utility standard under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The statement that only one identifiable benefit to is needed to satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 101 (Brief filed March 12, 2007, paragraph bridging pages 5-6) is correct, but what is lacking in the instant application is one identifiable benefit to the public. Appellants recognize that "some *immediate benefit to the public*" is required (Brief filed March 12, 2007, page 6, line 8), yet nearly six years after the effective filing date of the instant claims, that immediate benefit remains a mystery in this record.

Appellants assert that the utility of SEQ ID NO: 2 should be considered to be well-established because 60S Ribosomal Protein L10 is a well-known, established protein. Leaving aside the lack of a cogent definition of a "well-established protein", this assertion is unconvincing and not relevant. Appellants cite (Brief filed March 12, 2007, page 7, second full paragraph) a website that they claim was

Art Unit: 1634

accessed on February 22, 2007 (more than five years after the effective filing date of the instant claims). This citation has no meaning here because the putative evidence does not establish what was known as of the effective filing date of the instant claims. In addition, the website is improperly used because: (a) it does not meet the requirements outlined in MPEP 1206 and (b) there is no copy of what was accessed on the website in this record. Accordingly, this putative untimely filed evidence of which there is no copy in this record has been given no weight at all. However, to dispose of this issue and to expedite prosecution, the Examiner gives Official Notice that 60S Ribosomal Protein L10s have been known in microorganisms for at least thirty years. The issue here is whether such proteins have a substantial utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and that issue should not be clouded by assertions of whether such proteins were known or how long they were known. What is needed is knowledge of their utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and that is what is lacking in this record.

Finally, Appellants' argument citing *In re Oetiker* (Brief filed March 12, 2007, paragraph bridging pages 7-8) that "when a patent application claiming a nucleic acid asserts a specific, substantial, and credible utility and bases the assertion upon homology to existing nucleic acids or protein having an accepted utility, the asserted utility must be accepted by the examiner . . . " is not convincing because in the instant application there is no accepted utility for the protein in question. Thus, the facts here are distinguished from those in *In re Oetiker*.

### **C. The Claimed Nucleic Acids Do Not Satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-4 and 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The discussions under the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are incorporated here. Since the claimed invention lacks utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the instant application does not teach how to use the invention.



Art Unit: 1634


**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

- (a) Serial No. 09/619,643; Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences No. 2002-2046; Federal Circuit Case No. 04-1465; *Ex parte* Fisher, 72 USPQ2d 1020 (Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences 2004); *In re* Fisher, 421 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2005), a copy is included with the Appeal Brief filed March 12, 2007,
- (b) Serial No. 09/684,016, a copy is included with the Appeal Brief filed March 12, 2007,
- (c) Serial No. 10/361,942, a copy is included with the Appeal Brief filed March 12, 2007,
- (d) Serial No. 09/199129, a copy is included with the Appeal Brief filed March 12, 2007, and
- (e) Serial No. 09/615,606; Appeal 2006-3376, decided February 28, 2007, copy attached hereto.


Art Unit: 1634


For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James Martinell  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1634  
11/29/07

Conferees:

  
PETER PARAS, JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

  
GARY BENZION, PH.D.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Attachment: Copy of *Ex parte* Abad et al, Appeal 2006-3376, decided February 28, 2007.


ATTACHMENT TO SECOND  
EXAMINER'S ANSWER

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was *not* written for publication and is *not* binding precedent of the Board.

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

*Ex parte* MARK S. ABAD,  
ROBERT E. BUEHLER,  
JOSEPH R. BYRUM,  
BRIAN E. COOMBS,  
GREGORY R. HECK,  
THOMAS J. LA ROSA,  
DONALD E. NELSON,  
HRIDAYABHIRANJAN SHUKLA, and  
MICHAEL D. THOMPSON



Appeal 2006-3376  
Application 09/615,606  
Technology Center 1600

ON BRIEF

Before SCHEINER, GRIMES, and LEOVITZ, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

LEOVITZ, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

**DECISION ON APPEAL**

Claims 1 and 8-13, all the pending claims, are on appeal. Br. 2. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b). We affirm.

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This appeal involves claims to a substantially purified nucleic acid molecule having the nucleic sequence of SEQ ID NO:2. The nucleic acid was randomly selected from a soybean cDNA library. Specification 1: 5-15; 104: 20 to 119: 18 (Examples). It is also known as an “expressed sequence tag” or an “EST.” *Id.* at 1: 13. SEQ ID NO:2 is one of 91,663 ESTs described in the instant application. *Id.* at 11. The ESTs described in the application encode proteins or protein fragments and represent mRNAs which are expressed in soybean cells. *Id.* at 1.

There are two rejections on appeal:

1) Claims 1 and 8-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as lacking utility. Answer 3. These claims are also rejected under § 112, first paragraph as lacking enablement because one skilled in the art would not know how to use an invention which lacks utility. *Id.* at 5. If a claim fails to meet the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 101 because it is not useful, then it necessarily fails to meet the how-to-use aspect of the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. *In re Fouché*, 439 F.2d 1237, 1243, 169 USPQ 429, 434 (CCPA 1971) (If “compositions are in fact useless, appellant’s specification cannot have taught how to use them.”); Manual of Patent Examination Procedures (MPEP) 2164.07 (Edition 8, August 2001; revised August 2006).

Although Appellants assert that claims 8, 9, and 10-13 are separately patentable (Br. 10), they rely on the same arguments presented for claim 1. Consequently, for the purpose of deciding this rejection, we select claim 1 as representative. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii). Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A substantially purified nucleic acid molecule that encodes a soybean protein or fragment thereof comprising a nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2.

2) Claims 1, 8, and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking written description (*id.* at 6).

We select claims 1 (see above), 8, and 10 as representative:

8. A substantially purified nucleic acid molecule comprising a nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2 or complement thereof.

10. A substantially purified nucleic acid molecule comprising a nucleic acid sequence having between 100% and 90% sequence identity with a nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2 or complement thereof.

## ISSUES

### *Utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101*

The Examiner contends that the claimed substantially purified nucleic acid molecule lacks patentable utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Answer 3.

The Examiner asserts that the general uses of nucleic acids which are set forth in the specification, including “acquiring genes, identifying polymorphisms, determining plant traits, and DNA mapping” are “not considered to be specific and substantial in view of the limited information provided in the specification.” *Id.* at 4.

Appellants contend that the disclosed utilities, including using the nucleic acids as probes and primers, and to identify polymorphisms, satisfy the utility requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they provide an identifiable benefit. Br. 4.

The issue in this appeal is whether the asserted utilities for the claimed nucleic acid molecules satisfy the utility requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

*Written description under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph*

The Examiner contends that there is insufficient written description of the claimed nucleic acid molecule comprising SEQ ID NO:2, and of molecules having sequence identity to it, because the claims embrace a genus of molecules which are not described in the specification. Answer 6-7.

Appellants contend that SEQ ID NO:2, which is disclosed in the specification and recited in the claims, is sufficient to describe the claimed invention. Br. 17.

The issue in this appeal is whether Appellants' disclosure of SEQ ID NO:2 is adequate to satisfy the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for claims to nucleic acid molecules which comprise SEQ ID NO:2 or which have 90% to 100% sequence identity to it.

FACTS

1. Claim 1 is drawn to "a substantially purified nucleic acid molecule that encodes a soybean protein or fragment thereof" comprising SEQ ID NO:2. Claims 8 and 10 are also directed to "a substantially purified nucleic acid molecule," but do not recite that it encodes a protein. All the pending claims refer to SEQ ID NO:2.

2. SEQ ID NO:2 is a definite and ordered sequence of nucleotides.

3. The nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2 is obtained by sequencing a cDNA isolated from a soybean cDNA library.

Specification 1: 13 to 4: 22; 104: 20 to 119: 18 (Examples); Br. 18.

4. The specification does not disclose an open reading frame for SEQ ID NO: 2 nor information about the protein it encodes. Answer 4.

5. The specification discloses a number of uses for the claimed nucleic acid molecule, including for determining an association between a polymorphism and a plant trait (49: 5 to 58: 2), for isolating a genetic region (14: 12-13), for determining the level or pattern of protein synthesis in a plant cell (15: 11-23), for determining a mutation in a plant (16: 10-11), and as probes and primers (24: 18 to 25: 2; 46: 15 to 47: 8).

## DISCUSSION

### *Utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101*

To fulfill the utility requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 101, a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility. *See In re Fisher*, 421 F.3d 1365, 1371, 76 USPQ2d 1225, 1230 (Fed. Cir. 2005). Appellants assert that the utility requirement is satisfied because the claimed nucleic acid molecule can be used to identify the presence or absence of a polymorphism, as a probe, and as a source of primers. Br. 6, 8. The issue before us is whether these utilities are specific and substantial.

Before addressing the specifics of this case, we turn to *Fisher* because that decision involved substantially the same issue and facts presented here. *Fisher*'s claims were to a "substantially purified nucleic acid ... comprising a nucleic acid sequence selected from ... SEQ ID NO: 1 through SEQ ID NO: 5." *Fisher*, 421 F.3d at 1367, 76 USPQ2d at 1227. This is the same claim structure of claim 1 in this appeal. As here, *Fisher*'s claimed nucleic acid was referred to as an EST. The Examiner had rejected *Fisher*'s claims

for lack of utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101, asserting that the disclosed uses were not specific to the claimed ESTs, but generally applicable to any EST. *Id.* The Examiner also asserted that the claimed ESTs lacked a substantial utility. *Id.*

Fisher focused their argument on two utilities: 1) use for the identification of polymorphisms; and 2) use as probes or as a source of primers. *Fisher*, 421 F.3d at 1368, 76 USPQ2d at 1228. These are the same utilities asserted here. Br. 6, 8. Fisher argued that ESTs were comparable to other patentable research tools, such as a microscope. *Fisher*, 421 F.3d at 1373, 76 USPQ2d at 1231. Fisher also contended that ESTs have commercial value. *Fisher*, 421 F.3d at 1377-78, 76 USPQ2d at 1235. In this case, Appellants make these same arguments. Br. 6-7, 11.

The court held that utilities disclosed by Fisher lacked specific and substantial utility because the function of the underlying protein encoded by the claimed nucleic acid molecule had not been identified. *Fisher*, 421 F.3d at 1376, 76 USPQ2d at 1233-34. Accordingly, they concluded that the claims did not satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

At issue in this appeal is the same type of claims, for the same utilities considered in *Fisher*. Appellants'<sup>1</sup> arguments also echo those made in *Fisher*. Like Fisher, Appellants have not identified the function of the protein coded for by SEQ ID NO:2. Answer 4. They also have not shown that any polymorphism or nucleic acid identified using SEQ ID NO: 2 as a probe or primer would have a "specific and substantial use." *See Fisher*,

---

<sup>1</sup> Monsanto Company is the real party in interest in the instant appeal. Br. 1. Monsanto was also the real party in interest in *Fisher*.



421 F.3d at 1373-74, 76 USPQ2d at 1232. Because of the parallels between the cases, we find that the same reasoning that led the court to reject the utility of Fisher's claims also applies to the instant claims. Accordingly, we affirm the final rejection of claim 1 for lack of utility under § 101 and lack of enablement under § 112, first paragraph. Claims 8-13 fall with claim 1.

*Written Description under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph*

The examiner has the initial burden of presenting evidence or reasons why a person skilled in the art would not recognize in an applicant's disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims.

*In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 263, 191 USPQ 90, 97 (CCPA 1976). "The 'written description' requirement [under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph] implements the principle that a patent must describe the technology that is sought to be patented; the requirement serves both to satisfy the inventor's obligation to disclose the technologic knowledge upon which the patent is based, and to demonstrate that the patentee was in possession of the invention that is claimed." *Capon v. Eshhar*, 418 F.3d 1349, 1357, 76 USPQ2d 1078, 1084 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

*Claims 1, 8, and 10-13*

Appellants have disclosed 91,663 nucleotide sequences identified as SEQ ID NO: 1 through SEQ ID NO: 91663. Specification 11. Each one of these sequences is obtained by sequencing a cDNA molecule isolated from a soybean cDNA library. Specification 104: 20 to 119: 18 (Examples); Br. 18. The invention of claims 1 and 8 is recited to be a "substantially purified nucleic acid molecule" which comprises one of these cDNA sequences, SEQ

ID NO: 2. Thus, Appellants possess what is claimed: a nucleic acid molecule, a cDNA, comprising SEQ ID NO: 2.

*See Capon*, 418 F.3d at 1357, 76 USPQ2d at 1084. For this reason, it is our view that the written description requirement is satisfied.

Admittedly, the written description has been applied more restrictively when the claimed subject matter is a DNA. *See, e.g., Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 25 USPQ2d 1601 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997). “A cDNA is not defined or described by the mere name ‘cDNA,’ even if accompanied by the name of the protein that it encodes, but requires a kind of specificity usually achieved by . . . the recitation of the sequence of nucleotides that make up the cDNA.” *Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568-69, 43 USPQ2d at 1406. *See also Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1170-71, 25 USPQ2d at 1606-07. Thus, the written description of a nucleic acid molecule is satisfied by the disclosure of its nucleotide sequence. Here, the specification discloses a definite and precise nucleotide sequence of the claimed nucleic acid molecule: SEQ ID NO:2. Accordingly, we find that the disclosure of SEQ ID NO:2 is sufficient to satisfy the written description requirement for claims 1 and 8 even under the more rigid standard.

The Examiner argues that the claims lack written description because SEQ ID NO: 2 is not a complete gene. Answer 6.

[T]he claims embrace full length mRNAs, cDNAs and genomic sequences, and the specification provides no physical (i.e. structural) characteristics of these molecules to distinguish them from other nucleic acid molecules comprising the claimed SEQ ID NO. 2, and no other indication that would suggest Appellant possessed them.

Supp. Answer 2.

Contrary to the Examiner's argument, Appellants have described a physical characteristic and feature of the claimed invention that distinguishes it from other nucleic acid molecules: SEQ ID NO:2, a defined and ordered nucleotide sequence. Full-length mRNAs, complete cDNAs, and genomic sequences which contain SEQ ID NO:2 would each be characterized by this definite sequence. We can find no language in the claim that would require a description of non-coding and regulatory sequences as demanded by the Examiner. Answer 6. The Examiner appears to have read limitations into the claim which are not there.

To determine compliance with the written description requirement, it is necessary that the patent disclosure be sufficiently detailed to enable a person of skill in the art to recognize that applicants have invented what is claimed. *LizardTech Inc. v. Earth Resource Mapping Inc.*, 424 F.3d 1336, 1344, 76 USPQ2d 1724, 1732 (Fed. Cir. 2005). Here, Appellants have invented SEQ ID NO:2 and claim molecules which comprise it. We do not see how possession of the claimed nucleic acid molecule is lost by appending other sequences to SEQ ID NO:2.

Claim 1 also recites that the nucleic acid molecule "encodes a soybean protein or fragment thereof." The Examiner asserts that the claim lacks written description because the specification does not identify its open reading frame or the protein which it encodes. Answer 3-4.

The purpose of the written description requirement is to establish possession of the claimed invention. The touchstone of possession for a nucleic acid molecule is its nucleotide sequence. *Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568-69,

43 USPQ2d at 1406. *See also Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1170-71, 25 USPQ2d at 1606-07. In this case, what is claimed is a nucleic acid molecule which comprises the nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2. The recitation in the claim that molecule encodes “a soybean protein or fragment thereof” is merely a statement of a function, or inherent property, which is a consequence of it being isolated from a cDNA library. Br. 18. Consequently, it is not necessary in this case for the specification to describe the protein or its open reading frame to comply with the written description requirement.

*Claims 10-13*

Claims 10-13 are drawn to nucleic acid molecules having 90% to 100% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:2. The Examiner further considers these claims unpatentable because the specification does not disclose “what is the necessary common attribute for the polynucleotides encompassed by the claimed genus to encode proteins belonging to the same species.”<sup>2</sup> Supp. Answer 2. *See also* Answer 8.

Under *Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406, a written description of a genus can be satisfied by describing a structural feature “commonly possessed” by its members. In this case, the requirement in claim 10 that the claimed molecule comprise “between 100% and 90% sequence identity with a nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2” is a structural feature “commonly possessed” by members of the claimed genus.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Examiner’s statement is incorrect. The claims do not require the genus members “to encode proteins belonging to the same species.” Supp. Answer 2.

Appeal No. 2006-3376  
Application No. 09/615,606

Members of this genus can be determined using known alignment algorithms. Specification 5: 20 to 6: 20. Accordingly, we find the written description requirement to be satisfied for claims 10-13.

In summary, we find claims 1, 8, and 10-13 to be in compliance with the written description requirement. The rejection is reversed.

TIME PERIOD FOR RESPONSE

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).


*AFFIRMED*



TONI R. SCHEINER )  
Administrative Patent Judge )



ERIC B. GRIMES )  
Administrative Patent Judge )



RICHARD M. LEOVITZ )  
Administrative Patent Judge )

) BOARD OF PATENT  
) APPEALS AND  
) INTERFERENCES

RML/jlb

Appeal No. 2006-3376  
Application No. 09/615,606

LAWRENCE M. LAVIN JR.  
MONSANTO COMPANY  
PATENT DEPARTMENT, E2NA  
800 NORTH LINDBERG BLVD.  
ST. LOUIS, MO 63167